

Application No. 10/661,817
Reply dated December 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 29, 2005

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 10-76 are pending in this Application. Applicant would initially like to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 10-67. By this Amendment, claims 1-9 are canceled. Claims 10-67 are amended to correct formal matters. Claims 27, 34, 37, 39-41, 47-50, 57-58, 61, 63, and 66-67 are amended to change dependency as necessary to provide proper antecedent basis. New claims 68-76 are added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

II. Specification

By this Amendment, Applicant amends the specification to correct formal matters and inadvertent typos. Applicant respectfully submits that the objection has been overcome.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In numbered paragraph 3 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action dated September 29, 2005, claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,768,262 to Gunter. By this Amendment, Applicant cancels claims 1-9 without prejudice, thus rendering the rejection moot.

In numbered paragraph 4 on pages 3-4 of the Office Action dated September 29, 2005, claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,869,759 to Savageau et al ("Savageau"). Applicant respectfully points out that although the general statement of the rejection denotes that "Claims 1-10 are rejected", the particulars of the rejection make clear that the Office Action rejects only claims 1-9. By this Amendment, Applicant cancels claims 1-9 without prejudice, thus rendering the rejection moot.

New claims 68-76 are added. New claims 68-73 recite a method for adjusting nip line spacing in a drawing mechanism of a draw frame for fibre slivers. New claims 74-76 recite an adjustable drawing mechanism in a draw frame for fibre slivers. Applicant respectfully points out that new claim 68 recites “each mounting device including at least one lower roller and at least one upper roller adjustably loaded on top of the lower roller, and at least one of the at least two mounting devices including a pulley wheel in driving connection with a driving element” as well as the step of “adjusting the nip line spacing between the at least two mounting devices via the drive element.” Likewise, new claim 74 recites “at least one of the at least two mounting elements includes a pulley wheel in driving connection with a driving element, the pulley wheel and the driving element being adapted to adjust the nip line spacing of at least one of the at least two mounting devices in relation to another of the at least two mounting devices”. The foregoing features and/or steps are not taught or suggested by either one of Gunter or Savageau.

With reference to FIG. 4, Gunter discloses the following (column 5, lines 23-43):

With particular reference at this time to FIG. 4, the third adjustment of drafting apparatus 10 can be described. Spanner nuts 44 are provided at the top of each upper vertical mounting block 22 and are adapted to threadably engage the external threads provided adjacent the top thereof. In this fashion, spanner nuts 44 may be unscrewed to easily loosen the normally tight engagement of vertical mounting blocks 22 with upper support arms 24 (see FIG. 3), and upper vertical mounting blocks 22 may then be slidably adjusted relative to each other in order to properly position the associated upper drafting rollers 12a, 14a, 16a. Then, spanner nuts 44 are again tightened so that they engage upper support arms 24 with substantial friction as to be fixedly secured thereto.

Therefore, as described hereinbefore, it is possible to adjust the space A defined between each pair of drafting rollers of drafting apparatus 10, the downward force applied to upper

Application No. 10/661,817
Reply dated December 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 29, 2005

drafting rollers 12a, 14a, 16a, and the lateral distance between each of upper drafting rollers 12a, 14a, 16a.

Applicant respectfully submits that, although Gunter teaches adjusting the distance between top drafting rollers 12a, 14a, 16a by utilizing spanner nuts 44, this does not meet the limitations recited in new claims 68 and/or 74. Claims 69-73 and 75-76 depend from claims 68 and 74, respectively.

With reference to FIGS. 4 and 5, Savageau discloses the following (column 3, lines 32-46):

The bearing blocks 28 supporting the shafts of rolls 20,22,24 are slidable longitudinally of support arms 26, upon loosening of retaining bolts 30 associated therewith, to permit each of the rearward rolls 20,22,24 to be moved toward and away from each other and front roll 18 for the purpose of varying as desired the spacing or "ratch" distance therebetween. Those skilled in the art will understand that it is conventional to mount drafting rolls such as rolls 18,20,22,24 in the manner and for the purpose briefly described above, and will also understand that each drafting assembly 16,16' further includes associated top drafting rolls, weighting mechanisms, clearers and other conventional components not shown in the drawings.

Applicant respectfully submits that, although Savageau teaches adjusting the "ratch" distance between drafting rolls 18,20,22,24 upon loosening of the retaining bolts 30 associated therewith, this does not meet the limitations recited in new claims 68 and/or 74. Claims 69-73 and 75-76 depend from claims 68 and 74, respectively.

Application No. 10/661,817
Reply dated December 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 29, 2005


IV. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that all of the claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is respectfully requested. It is not believed that extensions of time or other fees are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. If, however, additional extensions of time are needed to prevent abandonment of this application, such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims or any other fee deficiency), are hereby authorized to be charged, and any overpayments credited to, our Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned Representative if necessary to place the application in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/29/05



Stuart I. Smith, Reg. No. 42,159

Robert Kinberg

Registration No. 26,924

VENABLE LLP

P.O. Box 34385

Washington, D.C. 20043-9998

Telephone: (202) 344-4000

Telefax: (202) 344-8300

Attorney/Representative for Applicant

RK/RMF